REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 CFR. § 1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 22-42 are presently pending. Claims 22-35 are amended herein. No claims have been cancelled or withdrawn herein, nor have any new claims been added.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0004] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on March 13, 2009. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0005] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited references. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0006] The Examiner was receptive to the proposals, and I understood the Examiner to indicate that the proposed clarifying claim amendments appeared to

distinguish over the cited art of record. However, the Examiner indicated that she would need to review the cited art more carefully and/or do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

[0007]   Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0008]   If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can discuss this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0009]   Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments and Additions

[0010]   Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 22-35 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter.

Serial No.: 10/606,591
Atty Docket No.: MS1-0492USC1
Atty/Agent: Jason F. Lindh
-13-
lee&hayes   The Business of IP ™
www.leehayes.com   509.324.9256

Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

[0011]   Claims 22 and 29 are amended to include subject matter clarifying "presenting a logon user interface to each user seeking to use the single computer, **wherein the user directly interfaces with the single computer without implementing remote access**." Support for the amendments to claims 22 and 29 is found in the specification at least at page 6.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under §102(a) and §103(a)

[0012]   Claims 22-25, 28-32, 35-39 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by *Unix Unleashed* (Unix) and additional excerpts of *Unix Unleashed* (Unix Continued).

[0013]   Claims 26, 27, 33, 34, 40 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Unix and Unix Continued.

[0014]   In light of the amendments presented herein and the decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Anticipation Rejections

[0015] Applicant submits that the anticipation rejections are not valid because, for each rejected claim, no single reference discloses each and every element of that rejected claim.[1] Furthermore, the elements disclosed in the single reference are not arranged in the manner recited by each rejected claim.[2]

Independent Claim 22

[0016] Applicant submits that Unix and Unix Continued does not anticipate this claim because it does not disclose at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- "presenting a logon user interface to each user seeking to use the single computer, **wherein the user directly interfaces with the single computer without implementing remote terminals**"

[0017] The Examiner indicates (Action, pages 2-3) the following with regard to this claim:

---

[1] "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); also see MPEP §2131.

[2] See *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Serial No.: 10/606,591
Atty Docket No.: MS1-0492USC1
Atty/Agent: Jason F. Lindh
-15-
lee&hayes   The Business of IP ™
www.leehayes.com   509.324.9256

As per claim 22, UNIX teaches method comprising configuring a single computer with a single UI display to be concurrently and physically shared by multiple users by executing a plurality of concurrent switchable remote process enabled workspace environments within the single computer (UNIX: page 20; *multiple users share a single computer such as a server via, for example, terminals, the single computer is able to initiate remote processes*) comprising presenting a logon UI to each user physically seeking to use the single computer and within the single computer initiating a separate

remote process thread for each user that is authenticated by the logon UI, initiating a separate remote process associated with each remote process thread for the concurrent switchable remote process enabled workspace environments, displaying on the single UI display of the single computer only one of the process enabled workspace environments as active at a time and maintaining a list of remote process threads to support switching from a first remote process to a second remote process (UNIX: page 266; *UNIX uses XWindow where users use separate threads to login*; UNIX continued: fig. 8.1 of page p 432; pp 393, 431-434, 436-438, 441-456, 461, 463-466, 468, 471, 472, 474, 476, 897, 904-906, 926 and 1542; X Window system, the most common graphical interface for UNIX, can have multple windows but only one window is active at a time).

[0018]   The Unix reference does not disclose "presenting a logon user interface to each user seeking to use the single computer, **wherein the user directly interfaces with the single computer without implementing remote terminals**" as presently claimed by independent claim 22. The present application makes clear that "by using a separate desktop for each user, multiple

Serial No.: 10/606,591
Atty Docket No.: MS1-0492USC1
Atty/Agent: Jason F. Lindh
-16-
lee&hayes   The Business of IP ™
www.leehayes.com   509.324.9256

users can be logged on to **the** computer simultaneously." (See Application, pg. 7). Unix, instead, as the Examiner has pointed out, discloses "multiple users share a single computer, such as a server, via terminals." (See Action, pg. 2). As such, Unix and Unix Continued do not disclose each element of independent claim 22.

[0019] Consequently, Unix and Unix Continued do not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 23-28

[0020] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 22. As discussed above, claim 22 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claim 29

[0021] Applicant submits that Unix and Unix Continued does not anticipate this claim because it does not disclose at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- "presenting a logon user interface to each user seeking to use the single computer, wherein the user directly interfaces with the single computer without implementing remote access;"

[0022] The Unix reference does not disclose "presenting a logon user interface to each user seeking to use the single computer, **wherein the user directly interfaces with the single computer without implementing remote terminals**" as presently claimed by independent claim 29. The present application makes clear that "by using a separate desktop for each user, multiple users can be logged on to **the** computer simultaneously." (See Application, pg. 7). Unix, instead, as the Examiner has pointed out, discloses "multiple users share a single computer, such as a server, via terminals." (See Action, pg. 2). As such, Unix and Unix Continued do not disclose each element of independent claim 29.

[0023] Consequently, Unix and Unix Continued do not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 30-35

[0024] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 29. As discussed above, claim 29 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claim 36

[0025]   Applicant submits that Unix and Unix Continued does not anticipate this claim because it does not disclose at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- "the single computer comprising: a single user interface display;"

[0026]   The Examiner indicates (Action, pages 2-3) the following with regard to this claim:

Claims 29 and 36 are individually similar in scope to claim 22 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

[0027]   In rejecting claim 36, the Examiner uniformly rejects claims 29 and 36 without specifically addressing each element. Notably, the Examiner fails to address each element of independent claim 36, namely that the single computer comprise (in part) "a single user interface display."

[0028]   The Examiner admits, in rejecting claim 1, the single computer disclosed by Unix is a server that includes multiple terminals that facilitate multiple users to be concurrently and physically sharing. For a terminal to be used in the manor suggested by the Examiner there would need to be multiple interface displays. Thus, Unix cannot disclose the single computer comprising a single user interface display as presently claimed by independent claim 36.

[0029]   Consequently, Unix and Unix Continued do not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 37-42

[0030] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 29. As discussed above, claim 29 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0031] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met. Each rejected claim under the obviousness standard is a dependent claim, thus each claim is at least allowable for the reasons discussed above regarding each respective independent claim.

Dependent Claims

[0032] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Serial No.: 10/606,591
Atty Docket No.: MS1-0492USC1
Atty/Agent: Jason F. Lindh
-20-
lee&hayes   The Business of IP ™
www.leehayes.com   509.324.9256

Conclusion

[0033] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action**. Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/   Dated: 2009-03-23
Jason F. Lindh (jason@leehayes.com; x4715)
Registration No. 59090
Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com